

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/523,989	SCHAFFER, KARL ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie J. Evanisko	2854	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Leslie J. Evanisko. (3)_____.

(2) Doug Hanscom. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims pending, particularly claims 49 and 70.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record, particularly WO 02/43692 A2.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner contacted applicant's representative to propose amending claim 49 to better define the bow so as to distinguish from the prior art teachings. In particular, the Examiner suggested adding the subject matter of claim 70 to claim 49. Furthermore, the Examiner also suggested several minor claim and specification changes to correct other minor formalities. Applicant's representative agreed that these changes could be made by Examiner's amendment. See the Examiner's Amendment for detailst .